

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of May 13, 2008 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 5-6, 10-34, 37-40 remain in this application. Claims 2-4, 7-9, 35 and 36 are canceled.

Applicant confirms the election of Group I claims 1-33 and 39 and compound 181. Rejoinder of the non-elected claims is requested upon allowance of claims 1 and 39.

### Rejection of the Claims

It is respectfully submitted that the elected species finds support in GB 0312296.7 filed 29 May 2003. Elected Example 181 corresponds to formula I of claim 1 wherein R is bromo (bromo being specifically mentioned as an R substituent in claim 1), n is 0 (specifically permitted by claim 1), ring A is phenyl (see claim 3), Q is  $-(\text{Alk}^1)_p-(\text{X})_r-(\text{Alk}^2)_s-\text{Z}$  wherein p and s are 0 and r is 1 (see claim 20), X is 0 (specifically mentioned in claim 1), Z is phenyl (see claim 24),  $\text{R}_1$  is  $-(\text{Alk}^3)_a-(\text{Y})_b-(\text{Alk}^4)_d-\text{B}$ , B is cyclohexyl substituted by amino (see claims 6 and 7), a and d are 0 and b is 1 (specifically allowed by claim 1), and Y is  $\text{NR}^A$  where  $\text{R}^A$  is hydrogen (specifically allowed by claim 1). Thus we believe that the priority date for the elected subject matter is 29 May 2003.

Claims 1-5, 9, 13, 16-17, 21-22, 24, and 29-33 stand rejected as the specification is not enabling for all compounds of the general formula in claim 1 for inhibiting the activity of any and all kinases. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The examples in the specification provide specific support for the compounds as inhibitors of CDK2 activity, PDK1 activity, CHK1 activity, or combinations thereof. The claims have been amended to recite these particular activities. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-5, 9, 13, 16-17, 21-22, 24, and 29-33 stand rejected as indefinite in regard to the term "Q" in claim 1. The phrase "in any compatible combination" has been deleted from the claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-5, 9, 13, 16-17, 21-22, 24, and 29-33 stand rejected as unpatentable over Guzi (US 7,119,200) in view of Wilde (US 7,291,603) and Himmelsbach (US 5,821,240).

As stated in the paragraph at the top of page 11 of the Office Action, the present elected compound has a phenyl ring A directly linked to the nitrogen whereas Guzi has an intervening methylene spacer. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that  $n$  is 0 and A is a phenyl ring. Guzi hence does not teach or suggest the compound of claim 1. Moreover, there is no reason one skilled in the art would have modified Guzi to eliminate the methylene spacer without any direction to do so. Neither Wilde nor Himmelsbach remedy the defects of Guzi as neither provides one skilled in the art with any incentive to omit the methylene from Guzi.

Wilde is directed to compounds which are not kinase inhibitors, so one skilled in the art would not have applied any alleged structure-activity features of the Wilde compounds to the teachings of Guzi. In any event, Wilde was cited in relation to the  $R_1$  group of the present compounds and has no bearing on the necessity or otherwise of the methylene between ring A and the nitrogen. Himmelsbach likewise was not cited in relation to the necessity or otherwise of the methylene between ring A and the nitrogen, but only in relation to the phenoxy-substitution in present ring A. Therefore, the effect of omitting the methylene spacer from Guzi on the biological activity of the Guzi compounds is not known from any of the teachings of Guzi, Wilde, and Himmelsbach. There is simply no motivation or direction to remove the methylene group from Guzi. Thus none of Guzi, Wilde, and Himmelsbach teaches or suggests independent claim 1, as amended, independent claim 39, or any claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

### CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: November 13, 2008

By: /Susan A. Wolfe/  
Susan A. Wolfe  
Registration No. 33,568

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001